vide this floor of financial security for handicapped workers employed in sheltered workshops.

My bill would amend section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act to do the following:

First. Increase the wages paid handicapped workers in sheltered workshops to 50 percent of the prevailing minimum wage effective January 1, 1966; 75 percent of the prevailing minimum wage effective January 1, 1967; and the prevailing minimum wage effective January 1, 1968.

Second. Prohibit reduction of wages for handicapped workers who are receiving pay in excess of the prescribed minimum.

Third. Authorize payment of less than the prescribed minimums to handicapped workers being provided training or evaluation services in a workshop where work is incidental to the services, and to those individuals so severely disabled they are unable to engage in regular competitive employment outside the workshop.

Fourth. Establish an absolute floor of 50 percent of the prevailing minimum wage for all handicapped persons in workshops, including those engaged in training and evaluation programs.

Fifth. Establish a category of facility in the law to be known as work activity centers for handicapped individuals whose productivity is inconsequential.

Sixth. Authorize a study by the Secretary of Labor to determine rates of compensation for individuals in work activity centers.

Seventh. Provide for annual certification by State vocational rehabilitation agencies for individuals to be paid less than the minimum wage and for those in work activity centers.

The bills I introduced in prior Congresses to improve section 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act for handicapped workers in sheltered workshops have consistently had the support of the National Federation of the Blind. I am pleased to say that the bill I am introducing today has the support of that organization and two additional major organizations in the field of work for the blind persons of this Nation—the American Association of Workers for the Blind and the American Foundation for the Blind. With this added support, I am hopeful that the 89th Congress will take favorable action on it.

I commend this bill, therefore, to all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives as a just and fair measure designed to improve the lot of handicapped workers in sheltered workshops in the same way the wage structure has been improved for nonhandicapped workers over the years.

OPPOSITION TO VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

(Mr. NIX (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Colorado) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of Congress and for all others who have been misled by misinformation pertaining to voting rights enjoyed by Negroes in South Carolina, I herewith categorically assert that whereas virtually every South Carolina political figure has issued a statement opposing S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, such statements usually include references to the free and open registration process as it is practiced in South Carolina.

The fact is that this alleged liberality is a myth.

The bare statistical facts show that as of November 1, 1964, 19 of the 46 counties in South Carolina had a Negro registration rate under 30 percent of the total number of eligible Negros in the respective county. Two counties of the State had Negro registration rates lower than 10 percent.

Not a single county in South Carolina, however, had a white registration rate lower than 45 percent, and seven had a white registration rate in excess of 100 percent of the total number of eligible whites.

South Carolina is one of two States which does not have a compulsory school attendance law, and the economic facts of life in South Carolina keep a great many Negro children from ever obtaining even a basic education. Sixty-one percent of the State's Negro population over 25 years old have only a sixth-grade education or less. The literacy test used in South Carolina effectively disfranchises a great portion of these citizens.

In addition, in off-election years, registration books in most counties are open only 1 day per month at the county courthouse and even then only from 9 o'clock to 5 o'clock with an hour or more off for lunch. In many cases, it is extremely difficult for Negroes to obtain time off from their jobs in order to go to the county seat to register. A trip to the county seat may involve a round trip of as much as 80 miles, and, of course, there is no guarantee that the prospective voter will be able to register during this day due to slowdown tactics which have been used in some counties.

There are also very strong psychological barriers inherent in a situation where Negroes must face an all-white, and often hostile, registration board in order to complete the registration process.

Last, but by no means least, many, many Negroes feel that their jobs would be placed in jeopardy if they were to register to vote. This is particularly true among the tenant farmers and domestics who make up a large percentage of the total Negro work force in South Carolina.

Further, as a part of my remarks, I incorporate a resolution of the South Carolina voter education project, passed April 27, 1965, which is as follows:

Whereas despite percentage increases in the number of Negroes registered to vote in the State of South Carolina, tremendous difficulties remain to be overcome in the area of voter registration in South Carolina; and

Whereas the lingering effects of a long-standing system of legal, political, and social segregation hinders the completion of the enfranchisement of all qualified voters; and

Whereas these effects vary greatly in intensity from county to county in South Carolina; and

Whereas the key provisions of S. 1564, the proposed Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, contain procedures designed to mitigate in part these discriminatory effects: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the South Carolina voter education project formally endorse S. 1564, the proposed Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the South Carolina voter education project urge the immediate passage of this act by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive committee of the South Carolina voter education project strongly urge each Representative and Senator from South Carolina to support this act, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives.

STATEMENT URGING CONGRESS TO TAKE A POSITION ON SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Colorado) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased today to submit the following statement to the distinguished chairlady of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Foreign Affairs Committee:

TESTIMONY OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EUROPE, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MAY 12, 1965

Madam Chairman, I am delighted for this opportunity of sharing, with the Subcommittee on Europe my views on the resolutions placing the House of Representatives on record as opposing religious intolerance in the Soviet Union, particularly those actions against Soviet Jewry.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to catalog all the grievances that freemen can register against the Soviet Union for indulging in the tyranny of anti-Semitism. During the past few years the story has been told and retold in the public press, in public meetings, and on the floor of the House. Leading Jewish organizations in this country and abroad have published extensive and well documented reports on the dimension of Soviet anti-Semitism.

We know, therefore, Madam Chairman, that Soviet Jewish citizens have been singled out for the severest type of discriminatory action. They have been falsely charged with so-called economic offenses, and in many cases the death penalty has actually been imposed. In the religious realm Soviet Jewry has suffered the severest forms of disabilities. The education of young rabbis, a vital aspect of the life of any religious community, is made extraordinarily difficult. Until the year 1957, there was no Jewish institution to train rabbis. In that year a rabbinical academy was established as an adjunct to the great synagogue in Moscow. Other forms of discrimination in the religious realm have taken the shape of restrictions on publications. It has been impossible to publish Hebrew Bibles, prayerbooks, or Jewish calendars. Moreover, synagogues have been closed, cemeteries desecrated, and the overall practice of Jewish religious life rendered very, very difficult.

In the cultural realm Soviet Jews have suffered considerably from Soviet acts of discrimination. Soviet Jews are actually a culturally deprived people in the Soviet

Union. The Yiddish theater, once the pride of Russian Jews is, practically speaking, a suppressed cultural form. Jewish literature, as a vigorous source of cultural expression, had been deprived of its former influence in the intellectual life of Soviet Jewry. Except for a few limited publications Jewish literature is simply not published.

Discrimination against the Jews has also reached into every other area of Soviet life. In the university and other institutions of higher learning, the Soviet Jew runs up against a wall of discrimination. Of course, any role he hopes to play in the political life of the country is drastically reduced by forms of discrimination that deprive him of the full exercise of his natural gifts.

All of these sources of discrimination exist in the Soviet Union, and they exist in spite of constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion.

House Resolution 50 which I introduced on January 4, 1965, and which this subcommittee is now considering, asks that the House of Representatives take a public position condemning anti-Semitism and any other anti-religious action in the Soviet Union. The resolution states that it is the sense of the House that the persecution of any persons because of religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviets, "in the name of decency and humanity," stop executing persons for alleged economic offenses. It also urges that the Soviet Union permit fully the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within the Soviet borders.

This resolution deserves the support of all freemen. It speaks from the soul of our Nation. Its sentiments are rooted in our historic declarations on religious liberty and thus reflect those great American qualities that have always shone through our historic past. But more than that these words are phrased in the spirit of that larger, more universal idea of man's right to exercise freely his own religious beliefs.

I also urge the adoption of my House Concurrent Resolution 211 which provides for the House and the Senate to jointly express the sentiments contained in House Resolution 50.

Such sentiments are also embodied in my House Concurrent Resolution 31 which states that, and I quote:

"It is the sense of the Congress that the United Nations should forthwith adopt a universal declaration calling for the elimination of all religious intolerance and all discriminatory practices against religious and ethnic groups."

Madam Chairman, I urge this subcommittee to act affirmatively on these resolutions condemning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union and urging the United Nations to take action against religious discrimination and intolerance.

To do so is to reassert the historic traditions of our Nation, traditions that have been an inspiration to all men.

To do less is to fail in our responsibilities to our people and to our historic traditions as a nation.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART LXVI

(Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. EVANS of Colorado) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the second in a series on New York City's public housing and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 23, 1965, as part of the series on "New York City in Crisis."

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—THE 30 HURDLES TO PUBLIC HOUSING—THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST DON'T QUALIFY

(Nearly one-fifth of the 8 million inhabitants of this greatest city in the world continue to live in poverty—many of them trapped in dilapidated, rat-infested tenements, all victims of the slums. The chief means of escape would seem to be through the massive, multimillion-dollar, low-income housing program administered by the New York City Housing Authority, the Nation's largest landlord. It would seem to be—but it isn't. Here, in the second in a series of articles, Barry Gottehrer presents a study of the projects themselves—and a set of seldom-discussed eligibility standards that automatically bar many of the low-income families who need public housing the most.)

(By Barry Gottehrer)

Most New Yorkers think public housing is supposed to be designed and administered for the benefit of the city's poor—those who can't afford to move out of the slums on their own. They are the disenfranchised 1.5 million in this greatest city in the world, those who need help the most.

When Mayor LaGuardia set up the New York City Housing Authority in 1934, need and income were the determining factors in eligibility for admission—and that is precisely what they are supposed to be today.

What they are supposed to be—and what they are in reality—are two entirely different matters.

Handicapped by a shortage of Federal, State, and city funds for public housing, which seem to decrease each year, fearful that the projects were rapidly turning into Negro and Puerto Rican ghettos and pressurized by project managers to keep "problem" people out, the authority decided to shift directions in November of 1961.

This new direction took the form of the adoption of a long list of eligibility requirements called desirability standards for admission of tenants.

This list was revised in April 1964 and, though the housing authority does not like to admit it, the 10-page list today serves as a means of eliminating the vast majority of people who need public housing the most.

It is not at all surprising that most New Yorkers—including those who apply for public housing—have no idea that this 10-page list even exists. The checklist is not something the housing authority goes out of its way to make public.

Called the 30 hurdles of public housing, they are broken down into two groups—clear and present dangers, all immediate grounds for exclusion, and conditions indicative of potential problems, all grounds for mandatory examination before a final decision is made.

However, even before the technical screening, the average family in need of housing is discouraged from applying.

The applicant must first fill out a 4-page application, which asks for the usual name, address, and number of children. He also is asked for his marital status, military service, present housing conditions (hotel, rooming house, etc.), and why housing is needed. He must also include his work history, income history, and addresses for the last 3 years.

YES OR NO

Once his application is submitted, the applicant receives a notice telling him either that it has been accepted and that there is a 2-year waiting period or that it has been rejected because he earns too much to qualify or because he has not been a resident of the city for 2 years.

Even when an applicant is accepted, the acceptance must still be reviewed by the tenant selection and site management divisions and the project manager—and any of these can disqualify him.

In any case in which the applicant's record, the renting interview or information received from other sources establishes the existence of any one of the standards listed as a "Clear and present danger," the applicant is declared ineligible.

This ineligibility can be determined by any section supervisor of the tenant selection division or by a project manager, without review of the case by the social service division or by the tenant review board.

Cases where extenuating circumstances exist are reviewed by the tenant review board, but the number of cases in which changes are made remains small.

Applications falling into the second category—"conditions indicative of potential problems"—are turned over to the sorely understaffed social service division. Here again, the applicant's record, the eligibility interview with the family, and the interview at the project may serve as the basis for disqualification.

In these cases, however, personnel of the social service division establish priorities so study and review of those cases felt to be most urgently in need of rehousing.

The vast majority, however, because of the small tenant turnover (less than 6 percent a year), the limited funds for new construction and the vast number of applications (more than 100,000 last year), gather dust in the files, unless a newsman or a politician expresses personal interest in a particular case.

The factor of eligibility was highlighted by a recent housing authority survey of East 101st Street. Of some 300 families interviewed, the authority repeatedly found that more than 60 percent would be ineligible for public housing under the checklist.

"All that happens is that the ineligibles have to find another place to go," said one housing authority official. "What we're creating is pockets of ineligibles."

And, as the 30th hurdle in the checklist clearly states, "This standard is intended to include patterns of behavior other than those specified above which indicate potential problems should the family be admitted to a project."

In other words, an applicant can be rejected for any possible personality problem, as determined by the authority, and never told why he has been rejected.

This is an extract from a seldom-discussed 10-page check list used by the housing authority to determine desirability standards for admission of tenants:

NEW YORK CITY HOUSING AUTHORITY,
April 20, 1964.

To: Division heads and housing managers.
From: Irving Wise, director of management.
Subject: Desirability standards for admission of tenants.

The authority has established a new policy, setting forth detailed standards, to govern the admission to projects of families which behavior would interfere with neighbors or the proper operation of projects. The new policy is an outgrowth of an extensive study by the authority with the assistance of an Advisory Committee.

1. STANDARDS

A. Clear and present danger

1. Contagious diseases which create a hazard for other tenants.

2. Past or present engagement in illegal occupations.

3. Evidence that an individual is prone to violence.

4. Confirmed drug addiction.

5. Rape or sexual deviation.

6. Grossly unacceptable housekeeping.

7. Record of unreasonable disturbance of neighbors or destruction of property.

8. Other evidence of behavior which endangers life, safety or morals.